U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service

PB-255 250

PLAN METRO DENVER

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY WORKSHOP ON TRAFFIC CONTROL STRATEGIES

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

1973

210087

PB 255 250

PMD plan metro denver

FINAL REPORT

PLAN METRO DENVER - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY WORKSHOP ON TRAFFIC CONTROL STRATEGIES

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No.	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No. PB-255 250
4. Title and Subtitle Plan Metro Denver. Environmental Protection Agency Workshop on Traffic Control Strategies			5. Report Date 1973 6.
7. Author(s)			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Environmental Protection Agency, Denver, Colo. Region VIII.			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 11. Contract/Grant No.
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address			13. Type of Report & Period Covered 14.

15. Supplementary Notes

16. Abstracts

PLAN Metro Denver, an urban environmental citizens' action organization, received a contract from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to organize a workshop on transportation control strategies. The workshop was held November 15, 1973, in Denver. This document is the final report of the Workshop dealing with air pollution standards for automobile related pollutants.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

*Air pollution abatement,
*Exhaust emissions,
*Meetings,
Automobiles,
Colorado,
Municipalities,
Traffic control,
Environmental impacts,
Legislation,
Buses(Vehicles),
Parking facilities,
Inspection,
Policies,
National government,
Businesses,
Citizen participation.

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

Motor vehicle inspection,
Motor vehicle maintenance,
Restrictions,
*Denver(Colorado).

17c. COSATI Field/Group 13 B,

18. Availability Statement	19. Security Class (This Report)	21. No. of Pages
National Technical Information Service Springfield, Va. 22161	UNCLASSIFIED	33
	20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price $4.00/$2.25

FORM NTIS-35 (REV. 10-73) ENDORSED BY ANSI AND UNESCO. THIS FORM MAY BE REPRODUCED USCOMM-DC 8265-P74

FINAL REPORT

PLAN METRO DENVER - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY WORKSHOP ON

TRAFFIC CONTROL STRATEGIES

A workshop organized by PLAN Metro Denver
and contracted by the U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency which was held at the
Radisson Hotel
Denver, Colorado
Thursday, November 15, 1973

Pat Havekost, Workshop Chairman
John Morris, Co-Chairman

Felicia Muftic, President, 1973
Lynn Willcockson, President, 1974
PLAN Metro Denver

*** TABLE OF CONTENTS ***

About the Workshop.....1

About the Final Report.....3

Introductory Remarks, Pat Havekost.....3

Excerpts from remarks made by

John Green, Regional Administrator, EPA.....5

Lane Kirkpatrick, Technical Secretary, Colorado Air Pollution Control Commission.....5

John Bermingham, Governor's Environmental Advisor.....10

Summary of Panels

Legal Aspects of Transportation Control Strategies.....15

Bus Lanes and Peripheral Parking.....17

Parking Restrictions.....19

Carpools.....22

Inspection, Maintenance and Retrofit.....24

The Role of Media in Gaining Public Acceptance.....25

The Role of Government and Enforcement Agencies.....27

The Role of Business.....29

The Role of Private Citizens and Pressure Groups.....31

ABOUT THE WORKSHOP....

PLAN Metro Denver, an urban environmental citizens' action organization, received a contract from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to organize a workshop on transportation control strategies. The Workshop was held November 15, 1973, at the Radisson Hotel in Denver. This document is the final report of the Workshop.

The Environmental Protection Agency has required that Colorado meet air pollution standards for automobile related pollutants by 1977. Plans to maintain standards by regulating indirect sources of air pollution, such as highways and parking facilities, must be presented by states for approval by the E.P.A. and preconstruction review must commence by January, 1975. An integral part of maintenance of air standards is controlling the use of the automobile.

Controls on automobile use proposed by both the Environmental Protection Agency and the Colorado Air Pollution Control Commission were the central points of discussion at the November Workshop.

The Workshop gave an opportunity for representatives of government, the business community and interested citizens to confront one another with their views on restriction of parking, car pooling, express bus lanes and pollution control devices on cars.

A diverse group attended the Workshop. Of the 157 people registering their attendance, 40 represented governmental agencies, 22 were from the business community, 78 were private citizens or were representing citizens or environmental organizations, 11 were planning or engineering consultants, and 6 were from the press.

Some of the governmental agencies represented were: The Regional Transportation District, Denver Metro Transit, Environmental Protection Agency, Denver Regional Council of Governments, Denver Planning Office, Mayor's Office of the City and County of Denver, U.S. Department of Labor, UMTA/Department of Transportation, Colorado Division of Highways, Colorado Department of Health, Adams County Planning Department, Tri-County District Health Department, Denver Urban Renewal Authority, Denver Commission on Community Relations, Governor's Commission on Employing the Handicapped, Denver Public Schools, Jefferson County Schools, Office of Congresswoman Pat Schroeder, Denver Health and Hospitals.

Business groups represented included: the Denver Chamber of Commerce, Aurora Chamber of Commerce, Denver Convention and Visitors Bureau, Downtown Denver, Inc., Colorado Petroleum Marketers Association, Skelly Oil Co., General Motors, United Airlines, American National Bank, United Bank of Denver, The Fulenwider Company, The Perl-Mack Companies, Gates Rubber Co., Sturgeon Electric, Dow Chemical, King Scopers, Stearns Roger, Coors Container Corporation.

Among the citizens' groups represented were : League of Women Voters, American Association of University Women, Bicycles Now, PLAN Jeffco, PLAN Metro Denver, Greater Park Hill Community, Inc., East Side Action Center, Capitol Hill United Neighborhoods, Fairmont Improvement Association, Montclair Neighborhood Association, Capitol East Residents Organization, Civic Center Association, South West Senior Citizens, National Association of Retired Federal Employees, Colorado Woman's Conservation Club, Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs, Sierra Club, Environmental Action of Colorado, WE Care, and Colorado Citizens for Clean Air.

ABOUT THE FINAL REPORT....

The goal of the Final Report is to present the various views expressed by the participants in the Workshop as accurately and as comprehensively as possible. A court reporter transcribed ver batim statements made by State and Federal officials in the morning session. Excerpts from those statements are included in the report. Members of PLAN Metro Denver took detailed minutes of each panel discussion held in the afternoon. Their reports (also transcribed by the court reporter) were made in the evening session. A summary of each report of the panel discussions was made. These summaries were sent to the panel participants for additions or corrections. The summary reports of the panels, amended and corrected, are also included in the final report.

Five months passed between the time of the Workshop and the issuance of the report. Two months were absorbed in completion of the ver batim transcript. One month was spent in review, comment, update and correction by panel participants and the EPA. The remainder of the time period was taken up by three revisions and final typing. All of which, including secretarial work,was accomplished with volunteer labor.

In April, 1974, it appears that, by and large, the Final Report is still relevant and timely. The problems are still the same as they were in November; the solutions and proposed regulations are approximately in the same stage of development. Due to the winter energy crisis, however, carpooling has met with increased public acceptance. In addition, the City government and the Regional Transportation District have begun to develop a plan for exclusive bus lanes.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS MADE AT THE WORKSHOP BY PAT HAVEKOST, CHAIRMAN OF THE WORKSHOP

I think it is marvelous that this many people from so many broad spectrums of the community have chosen to be with us today. We're all aware of how busy each of you is. The one thing I would like to point out is that while the four strategies that we are going to be discussing today are relevant to air pollution, they are also very relevant to energy conservation. Another point for discussion, and the subject that originally got me interested in the whole idea of transportation planning and the use of our resources, is the growth issue, the kind of community we live in, whether it be an urban or rural community.

We're talking about better use of our resources in the future. My own personal bias is that, in fact, through a more careful evaluation of how we use our resources, whether it be the clean air, which is rapidly leaving us. or whether it be precious energy resources, whether it be land, whether it be human time, these are all values that frequently get lost in many of the decisions we make. We must realize that these numerous things, if properly dealt with and creatively approached, can yield multiple benefits to all of us. In the last week we surely should have seen that the larger issues should join us together.

I would prophesize that in the next few weeks, we're going to see every issue that has ever been on anyone's mind dragged into this. We're going to see efforts to emasculate many kinds of legislation. I think the goal must be in the long run, how can we have clean air, efficient and wise use of energy, good land use planning and an environment and economic system that we can all live with.

I hope that we can approach today with a positive attitude and that each of you can go back to the organizations that you represent with positive results. I think we can do it. I think we can meet all of those goals.

Preceding page blank

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS MADE BY JOHN GREEN, REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR, REGION EIGHT
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The major thing back in Washington, as you probably realize, is the energy crisis. Senator Jackson has been working night and day with members of the Interior Committee to put together an energy bill. We, at the same time, are in the process of developing amendments to the Clean Air Act so that we are compatible with the energy bill, whenever it is passed out. I envision that what we will see is no change in the standards. However, I feel we probably will see some change in the time frames to accomplish these goals we have established.

As you probably realize, the Environmental Protection Agency, and environmentalists in general, have been blamed for the energy crisis. I think if those who feel this will look around, they will find just the opposite. We have had a clean fuel policy regarding low sulphur coal. We have induced the car manufacturers to label their automobiles as to miles per gallon. As far as the development of coal and oil shale, we have never said we're against this. We have said it has to be done early and properly.

And so, as far as we're concerned, we must do the job properly and still maintain the clean environment. At the same time, we must have a program compatible with the energy requirements of the nation...

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS MADE BY LANE KIRKPATRICK, TECHNICAL SECRETARY, COLORADO AIR POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION

..... We have to look hard at possible solutions to solve this Denver smog problem. It's going to take every ounce of control effort that we can squeeze out of essentially everything available to us, and I think that's something we have to recognize.

One question that constantly comes up is: is our plan based totally upon the data collected at one point in Denver: 21st and Broadway. Everybody knows that that's sort of a traffic island, and the feeling is we're pushing too hard and too far, based upon this one station. But we've had five other stations monitoring data since the beginning of this calendar year, and we're finding out some very interesting things. If we look at the hydrocarbon problem, we find a much higher level out in Arvada. The reason is the pollutants are generated over downtown, but the peak concentration of the oxidents is three or four hours after they are put in the air....Our present plan is designed to get a 64% reduction in oxidents, but if we based it upon the Arvada problem, we would have to aim toward an 80% reduction.

With respect to the carbon monoxide problem, this is more proportional to where the actual automobiles are concentrated. I think that we're going to find in time that wherever we have transportation corridors such as along the freeways and shopping

Preceding page blank

centers where we have large concentrations of cars, you are going to exceed the federal standard for carbon monoxide. So it is a metropolitan-wide problem, and we shouldn't be fooled by thinking that more information will show the need for less control. It's going to be the opposite, we feel.....

Certain industries and organizations can't quite swallow what's needed to meet the health protection standards. They push to get the Federal Clean Air Act relaxed. We ought to wait until 1976 before we make any rash judgments about what kind of constructive changes are made to that Act because we are just now starting to confront the public and work with organizations and groups. The transportation control strategies and the energy problem are going to help us implement these things. We ought to give it a chance to work. We ought to take a very positive attitude towards implementing these things before we sort of give up and say, "Look, we can't do it."

I'm sure there are going to be some cities in the United States that can't meet the federal standards by 1977, but they don't know at this particular point just what they will be able to do between now and 1977. I think we just ought to work with that Act and try to support it until we have concise data and know very certainly what additional time may be needed.

Now, getting into our transportation strategies, three of the strategies are listed as one, the semi-annual inspection and maintenance program using the idle test mode to be fully implemented by December 1 of 1975. This is mainly talking about Denver, but we have plans that once it's implemented in Denver, to extend it to other urban areas in Colorado.

The second strategy is that of the air bleed retrofit for the pre-1968 vehicles to be fully implemented by July 1 of 1976. I must emphasize in that particular strategy that we are considering other kinds of retrofit systems and altitude modifications, but for purposes of planning with just sea level data available to us at this point in time, that looked like the best alternative.

The third, covered under Senate Bill 393, is the high altitude and modification and tuning specifications for the 1968 through 1975 vehicles to be fully implemented by July 1, of 1976.

We have almost completed our testing program on three hundred vehicles using Automotive Testing Labs of Aurora. We are investigating the idle test procedure which would be used in the private sector of the repair stations. We are trying to define a rejection rate (a third of the cars on the road are not maintained the way they should be. The other two-thirds should pass).

We are studying many kinds of air pollution retrofit systems and also modifications to the carburetor, to the ignition system of the car, and various tuning specifications, which are essentially screwdriver adjustments or things fairly simple to do, essentially cleaning out the car.

All of these strategies we think will save gasoline because the poorly tuned cars are the ones that really use it. Cars aren't designed at this altitude for real lean operation, so in cleaning them out, you will use less gasoline and cut down on the carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon levels.

We are also studying performance of these cars and we are optimistic that we will be able to improve the performance by some of these altitude modifications.

There are three most important elements that this group should consider today with respect to these strategies. One is the overall test procedures. Now, that is a technical question. However, the second item is public acceptance of these programs. We need an awful lot of work done in this area. What we have done is spend twenty-five hundred dollars to develop five television spots to help implement the strategies. The third key element is the training of the repair industry to be well versed in maintaining the cars. Our test program has indicated to us so far that most mechanics in the area have a "hands off" policy with respect to the air pollution control equipment on cars for a couple of reasons. (1) They don't understand how they work. They haven't really been trained in how to set those things for low emissions and they are usually oriented toward high performance. (2) There is a federal fine if you tamper with an air pollution control system.

Because of the unique problems of altitude, we think we can get more control out of these strategies than at sea level. Another thing is the cost. It has been indicated to us thus far, although our final test results will be in next month, that the cost associated with this maintenance program will be about the same as the existing safety inspection program.

We also need to investigate consumer protection programs with respect to a maintenance program. A station that's performing inspections might, instead of rejecting the thirty-three percent failure rate we set, reject seventy-five percent of the cars to get additional business. We feel we need a good reporting system whereby, on a monthly basis, they send in their results to our offices,or to somebody else's office, so we can check to make sure that they are following the rules.

Another idea for a consumer protection program is to have a Referee Mobile Lab where, if somebody is rejected and he feels he has been treated unfairly, he could bring his car in and we could check it against what the station has said.

We need the Department of Revenue to have staff go out into the inspection stations to make sure everything is going along all right.

Another need is endorsement. Just how are we going to implement these programs. One idea is that, if we are going to require a modification of a carburetor, we do it based upon the last number or first number in the license plate so that we get about a twelfth of the people per month. By the first of the year, we will have all of the conversions put on the cars.

There is also some concern about someone who flunks, has the work done on his car, but then brings it back and it still flunks. What do you do with it? Do we write it off and say, "Even though he has an emission standard he has not reached, he has done everything reasonably possible," so at that point you let him off the hook? We will attempt to solve that problem by setting special standards for automobiles that, just because of the way they are manufactured, can't meet the requirements.

We are shooting toward the end of December to have all of our legislative proposals ready on those three strategies. Right now we have the ability to control smoking cars in Denver and smoking diesels statewide. We have the authority to set tuning specifications and we also have the ability to establish a fee for what it will cost when you go in for your inspections.

What we think we need in the way of legislation is accreditation procedures for the Commission to approve systems that can go on the cars, for altitude modifi-

cation, for consumer protection, and for mechanic training. We need to set up some qualifications tests and training requirements and the Act is not clear on that point. We must also define the enforcement mechanism to make this whole thing work.

The second area, the transportation strategy, is the area of essentially encouraging the use of public transportation and to develop what we would call "vehicle restraints".

We have proposed a revision to our permit system as well as a new regulation to handle this particular area.

We can use our permit system to maintain the standards once they are achieved. Our permit system, which now applies to stationary sources, could be expanded to what we call indirect sources of air pollution. Indirect sources are sources that generate significant volumes of motor vehicle traffic which, in turn, add to our pollution problem. This would set up a review procedure for any new sources coming into the Denver Metro Area. Builders of those new sources would have to come to us and submit an application to construct. There would be some requirements attached to the application. They would have to complete some air monitoring in the area of the proposed activity. We must first know what the existing air quality levels are before we can superimpose the new effect of the new source upon it to see if they meet the new quality standards. W e can determine what this incremental area would be by a predictive model.

Essentially, this indirect source regulation, Regulation 3, requires good planning. If we determine the applicant can't meet the ambient air quality standards, then we have a whole checklist of things that we ask, i.e. that they use to the maximum public and private mass transit. We can ask the applicant, for example, to see if they can contract with RTD for some express bus service, etc. We can ask the applicant to look at one building site versus another. If they locate in one place, they may have to have a freeway built to serve them; if they build in another place, maybe the PRT will serve it.

We also have proposed Regulation No. 9. There are three strategies in our Plan that are covered by this regulation. (1) The designation of mandatory bus and car pool lanes; (2) limitation on the construction of future parking facilities; and (3) the removal of on-street parking in the central business district. We have included in the regulation the request that RTD complete a plan for exclusive bus lanes and express bus service. With respect to future parking facilities, the proposed regulation permits the transferring of parking spots from one location to another, but it will not allow the building of additional spaces unless it can be demonstrated that the Federal standards won't be exceeded. We also have added a provision whereby any business employing more than fifty employees would have to provide some incentives to get its employees to either use car pooling or to use the bus system.

As far as possible legislation is concerned, it's a little premature to say, but there is a very important suggestion . The RTD system, when fully implemented, will only have eleven percent of the modal mix. Inother words, eleven percent of the trips per day on their system. If you look at the projections, after we have imposed all these other strategies, we need about thirty percent. We would like to see more buses and more PRT systems on the guideways than are presently planned.

One suggestion for legislation is a parking tax throughout the Denver Metro Area which would be used to buy additional buses and additional PRT vehicles. Another suggestion is opening up the Highway User's Fund (pertaining only to those funds generated in the critical air pollution areas) for construction of exclusive bus lanes and for additional mass transit vehicles.

We would like the RTD to develop plans for express bus services and lanes. They can't, however, endorse those plans, however, if there is a home rule city involved. They can refuse to take action. We are hoping we won't get into those kinds of things, but the EPA says by January 15, 1974, we must define all of the steps for endorsement and it must be workable or they won't approve our plan.

Those are the state strategies. The Environmental Protection Agency has proposed two additional strategies. One is a regulation which would control hydrocarbon vapors from stationary sources. We (the state) have adopted a hydrocarbon regulation that we can control one hundred thousand tons of hydrocarbon vapors a year. We think this will control forty percent of the requirement in meeting Federal hydrocarbon ambient air quality standards for protecting health in Denver, so that goes a long way. It's presently on the Governor's desk to be submitted to the EPA. It will become effective November 28th. The Regulations cover the use of organic solvents and it will put controls on the storage of gasoline and other petroleum products. These regulations will be expanded over the next six months to get at the auto refueling problem. Our Regulations will look at some kind of universal nozzle so that the fumes go back to the gas station and are recovered. The EPA will review our proposed Regulations and, if they find them acceptable, they will retract their own, or keep in effect only those proposals that they have proposed which are more stringent than ours.

The second strategy proposed by the EPA is gasoline rationing as a last resort. Personally, I am quite happy that the energy shortage is upon us because obviously this might take care of the implementation of that.

To implement the strategies that I have mentioned, we are asking for approximately a half a million dollars to enforce the strategies. We need enough people to review these permit applications for indirect sources, to review the permit applications for hydrocarbon source emissions in Denver, and to develop an air pollution predictive model which, in turn, we can rent back to industry. We are proposing financing this entire enforcement program by putting the expense of it back on the developers by charging a fee on a graduated basis. We think we could pay for all but forty thousand dollars of our total half million dollar program in this way.

In addition to technological solutions, the only way we are going to solve Denver's air pollution problem is to impose good transportation and land use planning controls. In the past we looked toward technology for solutions. Now we are trying to implement some changes in life styles and attitudes toward the way we use our automobiles. That's a most difficult thing to do. If we are very positive in the way we approach the public, we can make a lot of progress.

For example, a bus uses one-tenth of the energy that a private automobile uses. That's also true for the more advanced PRT systems. If you have a good transit system, you can relieve the mother of her role of chauffeur because there is no better way of getting her children around. If you can get by without a second or third car, even one car, you save out of the family income thirteen hundred dollars or so a year just by the time you add up all the repair costs, the potential for property damage, insurance, tires, and so on.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS MADE BY JOHN BERMINGHAM, GOV. JOHN VANDERHOOF'S ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISOR

Let me talk just a little bit about these transit problems and tell you one or two things that might be helpful. Transit problems have not been my No. 1 priority. I have been focusing my efforts really on legislation for the 1974 session of the General Assembly primarily dealing with land use. But, certainly, highway planning comes into this.

We have a bill you will be hearing more about on our planning regions. There are currently twelve planning regions set up by Governor Love last November. We probably will have a bill that will make those statutory regions with the likelihood that one of the regions will be split, which will give us thirteen.

The Highway Action Plan that is now under consideration, and which presumably is going to be signed by Governor Vanderhoof and forwarded to me, probably will be signed very shortly and submitted to the Federal Government. Highway planning in the future will be done primarily in these regions...not by the Highway Department any more, which will be quite a change.

The Denver region consists of Denver, Arapahoe, Jefferson, Adams, Boulder, Clear Creek, Gilpin and Douglas counties. The Denver Regional Council of Governments represents some, but not all of them. If the legislation goes through, there is going to have to be some sort of a change in the composition and structuring of DRCOG.

I personally have certain misgivings about the PRT (Personalized Rapid Transit), the proposal of the Regional Transportation District, and the Joint Regional Planning Program (JRPP).

I remember in the Legislature two or three years ago the RTD came in with a map showing alternative modes of activity, alternative development patterns, but I don't recall that you, the public, has every really come to grips and had a chance to get your two bits in on which development route we should go.

Similar to this, the JRPP is up for consideration next week. I haven't had a chance to study it thoroughly myself. Again, one of the complaints I have is not enough time; not enough staff to do all these things that have to be looked at. But I have serious misgivings. I don't feel that it's an overall land use plan. It's not a comprehensive plan. Out at DRCOG, they have admitted to me it is simply a transit plan based on the assumption where we're going to have thousands upon thousands of more people in this community and there has been no effort to assume that there is any alternate way of going.

There is no reason why you cannot get a sympathetic Legislator to introduce a resolution in the General Assembly next winter that there be public hearings on the transit plan of the RTD; whether we should go whole hog for the PRT, or

whether we should take a look at the bus system that is being proposed. I believe this group here could also make a formal request to DRCOG for a public hearing on their Joint Regional Planning Program. I think that they would have to supply a public hearing and give you the opportunity to submit your criticism and constructive thoughts.

I think all of us here should push for a two way regional cog that represents all of the counties in the eight-county region. I'm sure many of you share the same distrust that I have, and I've heard it from planners in some of the offices of communities in the region. They are concerned that the DRCOG plan is not as solid as it ought to be.

Let's push for true regional planning, comprehensive planning. Not just planning on the assumption that there are going to be all these additional people and there is nothing that can be done about it. I think lots can be done. We're behind, as usual. But don't give up.

(Mr. Bermingham answered some questions from the audience.)

A VOICE: You mentioned the public transportation. It's already approved. The PRT plan. You mentioned bringing it back to a public hearing. Why? What do you specifically think is wrong with it?

MR. BERMINGHAM: The bonds have been approved, that's ture. But the particular system of where the tracks are going to go and where the stations will be and whether you know they're talking about emphasizing certain activity centers...I don't recall any real public discussion of whether they've---the public---agrees that these are the right activity centers. Now maybe they have done the right thing, but more and more I feel that the planners should submit their proposal to the public in the alternative, so that the public has an opportunity to select the way it wants to go rather than some bureaucrats deciding in their back rooms that this is how we ought to go and then pushing it down your throats. Now, the RTD has made efforts to have public hearings and they have had public hearings,but they haven't presented alternatives for us to decide one way or another, I don't believe.

A VOICE: Are you saying you have specific engineering data and traffic data and passenger data available that leads you to these conclusions or is this just a gut feeling that leads you to this?

MR. BERMINGHAM: It's a gut feeling.

A VOICE: I'm wondering if we have public hearings at every station or proposed station location if we wouldn't end up changing every station location. And do you know, for general information, whether there was any good solid transportation information put together in DRCOG's plan, or was it just, "Let's take a map of the town and draw lines?"

MR. BERMINGHAM: Oh, no. I think they have pulled together a lot of information, but for example, I think they are very weak on our air pollution input. Very weak. I think they had only one man out there looking at air pollution problems.

A VOICE: Do you think a citizens group could probably put together better information to redesign this?

MR. BERMINGHAM: No. No, a citizens group can't do that, but I think they can insist that the planner show what was going on in the planner's mind.

A VOICE: Which might change the locations?

MR. BERMINGHAM: That's right. I certainly agree you can't have a public hearing on each station. But early in the game, the RTD people did come to the Legislature and show, "Here are some alternate patterns." That was the last I ever heard that. And it's always puzzled me.

A VOICE: And has the Legislature done anything to examine and find criteria for this plan, or have they just said, "I'm not concerned about it. It looks like it will do a good job?"

MR. BERMINGHAM: The Legislature hasn't taken a look at any of the specific plans at all. They just set the mechanical structure enabling the RTD to exist and do its work.

A VOICE: Okay. So you haven't really condoned or endorsed either way?

MR. BERMINGHAM: That's correct. And I'm just saying that the Legislature can serve as a tool for those of you here that would like to have a further look at some of these.

A VOICE: Well, I live out in the Northglenn area, and I know they had two meetings out there, public meetings.

MR. BERMINGHAM: Did they tell you "Would you prefer this plan or that plan?"

A VOICE: I think they did pretty much. They wanted your input of what you needed in that area.

MR. BERMINGHAM: Yes. But in that area. I'm talking about the overall scheme. They had three alternate proposals in the Legislature.

A VOICE: They did the same thing in our area.

A VOICE: Senator Bermingham, I think it's a very significant thing that you are raising questions, particularly on the PRT after an election of the people. What's wrong with the referendum systems that we have been using? In the case of the PRT, it was a part of the RTD package. I think many of us wanted mass transit. We had to accept PRT in order to get mass transit. The same is true in the recent water bond issue. There were three things put into one. And people had to vote on the whole package if they wanted some part of the package.

MR. BERMINGHAM: I'm not really knowledgeable enough to respond in any depth. I had reservations about the PRT and I know I've heard others. So all I'm doing here is I'm not saying they haven't come up with the right solution. Perhaps they have.

A VOICE: Do you feel there has been public input into the highway network part of the JRPP plan?

MR. BERMINGHAM: I don't. I was told by someone in the Highway Department that if there is a formal request of some sort from a group to hold a hearing, then they must hold a hearing. Maybe you can tell me how many hearings have been held on the JRPP.

A VOICE: None.

MR. BERMINGHAM: Then I think the mechanism is available to you, if you want a hearing.

Going back to the RTD, have they ordered enough buses? The tremendous delay between the time you put in the order and when you get it must be taken into account. Have they done enough to publicize schedules or are they planning to put schedules on lamp posts as they did in London?

A VOICE: Sure, don't you know that we have to wait twelve to eighteen months to get a bus manufactured after it's ordered. Before it is ordered it has to go through UMTA and all this red tape. That's the hang-up. We can't buy buses in Japan or Mexico.

MR. BERMINGHAM: I know you can't. Have they even ordered enough of them, though? I remember in World War II how suddenly they started turning out airplanes. They didn't wait two years to turn out airplanes. I think this nation can turn out buses if it wants to.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS MADE BY ANN WILLIAMS, TRANSPORTATION PLANNER FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT

(In the evening session Ms. Williams asked that her comments replying to Mr. Bermingham's comments regarding the RTD be placed in the record)

The Regional Transportation District has, in the past, and will in the future, continue to ask for, receive, and most importantly, listen to meaningful citizen input. This has been, and will continue to be, a matter of public record. We are in the process of taking a new look at our Citizen Advisory Committee structure, which will result in a more representative cross-section of citizen input.

Additional remarks were made regarding future public hearings on PRT stations and final PRT route alignments. It is my understanding from conversations with the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, that RTD is required by law to hold public hearings on PRT station locations and route alignments. In addition to that, RTD will be holding a public hearing during the first quarter of 1974 on the capital grant, capitalization, for the Early Action bus program.

Mr. Bermingham also raised concern that the Joint Regional Planning Program in its development concept did not receive meaningful input from the communities which would be affected by this plan or which are designated in the development concept as activity centers.

The Joint Regional Planning Program is made up of the Regional Transportation District, the representatives of six counties forming the policy body, the Colorado Division of Highways, and the Denver Regional Council of Government, representing five counties and many municipalities. All of the local representatives mentioned above, which form the policy bodies of these various organizations, are thoroughly appraised of the development concept as well as the transportation concept.

In addition, exhaustive meetings have been held over the last three years by RTD with local planners and local elected officials to ensure their knowledge and understanding of both the development concept and the transportation concept.

I would hope that this clarifies the record on the concerns raised by Mr. Bermingham.

SUMMARY OF THE PANEL: "LEGAL ASPECTS OF TRANSPORTATION CONTROL STRATEGIES"

Panel members: Ms. Cullen Phillips, Project Director, Clean Air Project
Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.
James Sanderson, Environmental Protection Agency Legal Staff
Dale Tooley, Denver District Attorney
Moderator: Pat Havekost, PLAN Metro Denver
Reporter: John Baker, PLAN Metro Denver

Ms. Cullen Phillips introduced her presentation by outlining the evolution of federal legislation concerning air quality from 1955 through the present. She stated that it wasn't until the 1970 amendment to the Clean Air Act that the Federal Government set standards, which if not met by state controls, would bring about federal action. Evolution after 1970 has been molded, in part, by the Natural Resources Defense Council's lawsuit against the Environmental Protection Agency asking the Environmental Protection Agency for the extensions that the EPA had granted on car manufacturers standards to be rescinded. The NRDC was victorious with their lawsuit and the extensions that were previously granted by the EPA were rescinded and new state guidelines were set.

Ms. Phillips stated that the main point of her talk was to stress that state enforcement plans and agencies must be given support by public groups and the public at large to bring about effective enforcement. State agencies must be supported because the state enforcement has more potential than possibly the federal enforcement through the Environmental Protection Agency. This is due to the past record of the EPA's propensity to grant extensions and variances. Citizens' support and action will assure that the states will adopt regulations in compliance with federal standards.

James Sanderson stated that the Clean Air Act and amendments work as an excellent prod for state and local action. He agreed with Ms. Phillips that the public support is required for the state and local agencies to be truly effective. Mr. Sanderson made one point that the Clean Air Act and state laws can be used by some groups, some parties to tie up enforcement in courts and in administrative proceedings. Public support from citizens' groups could possibly have remedied this.

Dale Tooley agreed with Mr. Sanderson that the law can both be a stumbling block and a club, depending on who is using the law. Mr. Tooley recommended that the enforcement laws of the states must be made more effective by adding penalties to the criminal provisions. The status of the laws concerning this area today is one of the criminal laws without penalties so enforcement is impossible. Tooley recommended that the penalties for violations should be misdemeanors, but reminded everyone that in Colorado there is a habitual offenders law whereby three violations of misdemeanor statutes could result in a felony conviction.

In response to panel discussions, Mr. Tooley observed that the three levels of government; federal, state and local, and the various sub-agencies within those levels of government, should not be so authority-conscious or ego-involved in dealing with Environmental problems, but rather should strive to cooperate with one another in enforcement of the laws.

A participant in the audience asked the panel whether citizens have any alternative to approaching referendum and elections when promoting an environmental issue. Was there a less strenuous and less expensive alternative than to have to resort to a referendum or election each time that an issue is raised. The panel didn't really answer the question other than to agree with the questioner that it is expensive to use the initiative and referendum routes.

Preceding page blank

It was the general concensus of most everybody on the panel that even though this may be the most effective remedy and maybe the only remedy for the public right now, public opinion is also a very strong thing.

Ms. Phillips was asked if the NRDC had resources to provide support on a consulting basis for local groups and agencies. She responded that the staff of the Council at the present time is not adequate to provide the type of consulting service that the questioner was asking about. The Council could act as a resource if questions were directed there.

One of the citizens present suggested to the group an alternative way to reduce and enforce the number of cars that are on our highways. The person suggested that we adopt an alternative where on alternate days even numbered cars with even numbered license plates could be driven downtown, and then on the alternate days, the cars with odd numbered license plates could be driven. This met with some acceptance by the panel members, although very little comment was made. They agreed that it was possibly a very inexpensive and not too complicated measure.

SUMMARY OF THE PANEL: "BUS LANES AND PERIPHERAL PARKING"

Panel members: Jim Graebner, Regional Transportation District
Ed Reutz, Denver Metro Transit
Dean Punke, Civic Center Association
John Morris, co-author of PLAN Metro Denver's Interim Transportation Plan

Moderator: Pat Havekost, PLAN Metro Denver

Reporter: Bruce Moyes, PLAN Metro Denver

Jim Graebner of RTD discussed three major points: (1) Exclusive bus lanes: RTD is working on the concept now. It is cooperating with the Highway Department. The 1973 Highway Act does include funds for this type of endeavor and RTD will be looking for those funds. RTD is doing a land study now. The results will be available in January and then with further study they can start implementation of the bus lane idea.

(2) Fringe parking: RTD has two programs started now. One is the Easy Rider program. It is a pre-paid system charging $23 per month which goes from Southglenn (an already developed suburban area) to downtown Denver. The average house in Southglenn has 2.8 cars. Easy Rider began in September '72 with two trips to and from. They are now up to six trips and the system is paying its own way. There are close to one hundred people waiting to get into that system, but because of an equipment shortage, the system can't accommodate them. The other program is called theParkerStage which is an express bus system from Parker to downtown Denver. The situation is a little different than Southglenn since Parker is an area just now developing. A monthly fee is also charged for the Parker Stage. There has been good success with this program, too, and while it is now in the development stage, it seems to be moving along pretty well. Fringe parking is included in both the RTD Early Action program and their long-range plans. They hope to use existing parking lots as much as possible though they might have to build some new lots.

(3) Gas shortage: If we have a gas shortage, exclusive bus lanes and fringe parking solutions will not help because there will not be enough equipment running. Equipment shortage: it takes ten months to order and there is not equipment to lease, either.

Ed Reutz also discussed exclusive bus lanes but he also stressed very heavily the problems of gas and equipment shortages. Denver Metro Transit has 260 buses. During the average rush hour, 254 of those buses are in use and they are overcrowded. He feared that if we get into a situation where we are forced into riding the bus by a gas shortage, a "World War II" situation might occur. This is a situation where the transit system was all there was and the people grew to hate it. As soon as they got the chance to get off transit, they jumped into their cars and never rode it again.

Reutz also discussed the "park and ride" situation. DMT now has eighteen locations city-wide, or metro-wide, with a total number of parking spaces of about 1540 or 1530. The problem with thattype of a system is that they need agreements with retailers if they're going to use the shopping centers. They are also studying the "kiss and ride" system where the wife drops the husband off at the bus stop.

John Morris made the point again that equipment is a short-term constraint. However, while it is short-term and it is something we have to worry about right now, we won't need to worry about that forever. Four years time when the regulations go into effect, Mr. Morris believes, we'll have the equipment and then we're going to have to overcome what he called the four objections to bus riding. They are not his objections, but objections he has heard others express.

1. Time factor: People say that riding the bus takes more time. Bus lanes would probably help. Good places to put bus lanes would be Colfax and 17th Street.
2. Cost factor: People think that because they have to pay 70 cents for bus fare and they can find parking for less, the bus costs more money. They don't equate what it takes to start the car up and to drive it 10 or 15 miles a day.
3. Comfort and convenience: Due to the tremendous growth in patronage and a lack of equipment, Denver Metro Transit can't guarantee people a seat when they get on a bus. DMT finds it hard to market a system that is already crowded. It's a problem which only additional equipment can solve.
4. Freedom aspect: How free is a person whose car is stuck in a jam on 17th Street? No more free than is a person whose bus is stuck in the same jam.

Dean Punke's major point was that as you move people out of cars into buses, neighborhood streets should be givenback to the neighborhoods. A detailed study was done by six community groups with the following conclusions: That as the bus lanes took over the automobile lanes, streets should be turned back to the neighborhood to allow the neighborhoods to function again. A bus lane will carry three times the number of people than will an automobile lane.

A question was posed of the panel what the prospects of banning automobile traffic in the central business district would be. The concensus of the panel was that it would be interesting to think about, but the practicality of it is about zero. Malls were also discussed. The panel discussed and expressed concern about persons who had their offices downtown and who had to use their private transportation to see clients and run errands. A total ban on private autos would cause havoc with those people as well as the retailers. These problems were not resolved by the panel.

The possibility of combining bus lanes and car pool lanes was discussed. DMT felt that his would not work at all because of the problem with the logistics of just trying to get the buses and car pools moving in and out. In fact, they were thinking of having separate express lanes and local bus lanes.

RTD pointed out the fact that once they take over the system, they'll be able to provide better service than DMT is providing because DMT can't expand unless the county wants to pick up the tab and guarantee that they don't lose money on it.

The last major point that was discussed by the audience and the panel was what the criteria was for establishing bus lanes and the implementation of a bus lane policy. Most of the members of the panel agreed that there should be no fixed criteria for establishing bus lanes. Each highway should be individually looked at and the criteria should be individually judged depending on the highway usage. The standard arterial street carries approximately 1100 cars per hour. One criteria would beif you want to establish a bus lane, more than 1100 people should ride the bus per hour...which is about what the automobiles would carry. The panel concluded that rigid rules would hurt the system and they would hurt the neighborhoods; there was no way they could come up with a black and white figure and say that any size street should have a bus lane.

In the evening session Ann Williams, an RTD staff member, clarified some points. She said the Easy Rider service was a demonstration project of RTD and is now under the control of the citizens of Southglenn who have taken the contract arrangements under their jurisdiction with DMT.

SUMMARY OF THE PANEL: "PARKING RESTRICTIONS"

Panel members: Tim Campbell, Downtown Denver, Inc.
James J. Nolan, Denver City Councilman
Felicia Muftic, PLAN Metro Denver
Moderator: Lydia Brown, League of Women Voters
Reporter: Frances Taylor; presentation made by Felicia Muftic in the evening session.

Felicia Muftic reviewed PLAN Metro Denver's Interim Transportation Plan and the Colorado Air Pollution Control Commission's proposed regulations 3 and 9... all of which had some bearing on downtown parking problems. She also mentioned that the EPA wanted to reduce traffic at around the 1977 level from thirty percent of what the traffic would be when the regulations went into effect. It was her conclusion, based on figures reported in the Interim Transportation Plan, that the Early Action system proposed by RTD, providing only 115 additional buses, was inadequate so far as it was expected to provide an alternative means of transportation. Imposing parking restrictions had to be seen in the light of viable alternatives. To provide the proper alternative, there needed to be a great emphasis on the Early Action program since PRT would not be operational until 1983.

Councilman Jim Nolan discussed Regulation 9 point by point. He commented that there was a substantial amount of parking facilities rented on a monthly basis and he wondered how this would be affected by proposed Regulation 9. He thought that the rate structure should benefit a car carrying more than two people; the cost benefit should be a break for cars which had three or four people in them. He raised the question about company and business cars. They went in and out of parking lots several times a day. How would the rate structure affect them? The regulation proposed offered a break for short-term parkers, yet that would not help air quality since most of the shoppers shopping the the downtown area probably worked down there anyway. Nolan thought that parking buildings deserved a rate break over parking lots since there was greater security in parking a car in a parking garage instead of a lot. The major question Councilman Nolan raised was: what would be the effect of the parking restrictions on the central business district. He was extremely concerned about the continued viability of downtown if parking restrictions were imposed.

Tim Campbell of Downtown Denver, Inc. also discussed the proposed state regulations. He believed that parking rates favoring car pools were unenforceable; that people would find ways to get around the rate structures that the car pool regulation would require. He thought, too, that shoppers would be penalized, and that the retailers were very concerned about the plan. Campbell questioned the legality of the car pool regulation and he thought the whole regulation pertaining to a rate structure favoring car pools should be scrapped. Carpools so far had not worked and there were real problems concerning insurance. How can we be assured that car pool drivers' car insurance would be valid, he asked.

Regarding provisions for bicycle parking, Mr. Campbell said that bike racks already were installed in downtown Denver and they were not used at all. Bicycling was only practical for three or four months of the year, anyway.

Requiring any parking restrictions or rate structure changes in downtown Denver would be discriminatory to downtown Denver in its competition with suburban shopping centers, Campbell said. Suburban shopping parking is free and the proposed regulation would destroy the economy of downtown Denver by making parking even more difficult in the core city.

Tim Campbell said that another effect of the parking restriction regulation would be to discourage developers from building in the downtown area. He also expressed concern that the regulation exempting parking lots of 50 spaces or less would just encourage a proliferation of small scattered lots.

Campbell thought the whole parking restriction regulation was unfair because it was punitive since there were no alternatives to parking in downtown Denver. He believed that the Environmental Protection Agency had been ineffective in dealing with auto manufacturers and yet they were turning around and punishing downtown Denver.

Ms. Muftic agreed that downtown Denver does bear the brunt of the regulations, but that an answer was to increase transit alternatives to the core city. She said that everyone should work together to make the Early Action bus plan a viable alternative so that downtown Denver would be kept a viable place. She askedwhy highways were still being built in the suburbs when we should really look toward the promotion of transit.

Councilman Nolan agreed that there were alternatives, but that public relations promotions should be used to promote their use. He believed that car pooling should be a voluntary thing and that it had the capabilities to accomplish the task at hand. He said that people must think in terms of car pools and that, once again, it was a public relations problem.

A young man from Boulder mentioned that he thought that people would use mass transit if it were convenient, but he could not see people giving up their cars. They were too used to them. He did mention that Mountain Bell had subsidized parking, but a PLAN Metro Denver member, Tom Vandegrift, suggested that money given to drivers for subsidized parking could be used for transit. Mr. Vandegrift also suggested that we should have more than one transit system. This would make for competition which would result in creativity.

Tim Campbell said that Downtown Denver, Inc. was promoting alternatives. He mentioned the 16th Street Mall, staggered working hours, and fringe parking. However, the proposed Regulation 9 and DURA requirements were contradictory. DURA is under federal order to provide a parking ratio per building that is one and a half spaces per 1000 square feet. On the other hand, the EPA is asking for parking restrictions. That is a conflict which should be resolved.

Jim Jones, a citizen in the audience from the Capitol Hill area, thought that the City should become more dense in the core area. He thought that parking restrictions might encourage density. However, he noted that high-rises were not built in Capitol Hill until off-street parking spaces were required. He suggested that creative zoning might provide greater density in housing. Councilman Nolan noted that the planning staff continued to promote down-zoning and single-family neighborhoods, but that we should be looking to higher density instead. Lydia Brown of the League of Women Voters also supported higher density living.

Mr. Campbell was fearful that the proposed regulations would promote urban sprawl by limiting growth in the center city and forcing new growth into the suburbs. Ms. Muftic countered by saying that the proposed regu lations themselves would limit suburban growth and that even suburban shopping centers would have their parking restricted. In addition, the transit system as planned would funnel people to the core city, providing a "captive audience" so that the downtown area would not die.

A senior citizen in the audience asked about those people who could not drive. The panel suggested that DART, the internal circulation system, should extend into residential areas within the Capitol Hill Area.

The panel also concluded that it would be a very good idea to divert funds from the highway user's fund into mass transit to provide the additional buses that would be necessary.

In the evening session, Dan Yurman from the audience (and a member of the Citizen's Advisory Committee)for the RTD proposed that the state statute prohibiting hitchhiking be set aside and that those people who wanted to hitchhike could be licensed. He suggested that by providing special areas to pick up hitchhikers on ramps along major arterials, picking up of hitchhikers could take place without blocking traffic. A student from the University of Colorado Denver Center also supported the concept of hitchhiking. He stated that hitchhiking is an alternative that hasn't been seriously considered because people are motivated by fear. He suggested offering a reward incentive to people who would cooperate in a hitchhiking program. He called hitchhiking a spontaneous car pooling system.

Tom Vandegrift spoke about the problem of insurance which was raised earlier in the day. Mr. Vandegrift is an insurance underwriter. He presented a copy of a company F.C.&.S. bulletin which was inserted in record (and appears in the complete transcript). The bulletin deals particularly with "Share the Ride". It makes a specific point that many people confuse their own public liability for liability that is covered under the auto policy. State statutes, often called the "guest statute", exclude liability for a passenger in his own auto. There might be some confusion as to whether or not a passenger in a car pooling arrangement was included or excluded under that guest statute, and a court test would have to be made on that issue. Another wrinkle might be what decision would be reached under Colorado's new "No Fault" law.

A member of the audience asked Mr. Vandegrift whether a hitchhiking individual was insured. Mr. Vandegrift said that his comments only applied to car pooling, but he imagined a hitchhiker would fall into the same category. If a person is a guest, he may not sue the person he is riding with. Mr. Vandegrift cited a case mentioned in the bulletin in which the policy covered liability even though expenses of the automobile trip were shared by the passengers.

Rick Morgan, another member of the audience and also an insurance underwriter, suggested that the legislature could clarify the No Fault bill before it went into effect in April so that there would be no questions about liability when carpooling.

SUMMARY OF THE PANEL: "CARPOOLS"

Panel members: Jim Mullen, Denver Chamber of Commerce
Dr. Yamahiro and Judy Ridgeway, Martin-Marietta
Professor Ralph Williams, Denver University
Moderator: Jo Anne Richmond, Tri-County Health Department
Reporter: Susan Morgan, PLAN Metro Denver

Jim Mullen of the Denver Chamber of Commerce reported on his organization's attempt to coordinate a carpool pool. United Bank was the organizer with several businesses joining in. The Chamber had expected two thousand downtown employees of a prospective eight thousand employees to participate...approximately 25% of the total employees of the participating businesses. Planning for the program began in March, 1972, and its operation began June 12. At its conclusion in November of the same year, it was apparent that the project was not working for several reasons: 1) there was a lack of centralized planning; 2) there was no central coordination; 3) there was a lack of planning within participating corporations; 4) there was an overestimation of a positive response rate. 25% had been planned for; 5% would have been more realistic. Only 541 of a possible 12,000 participated; 5) there was a lack of coordination by the Denver Chamber of Commerce concerning press releases and confusion resulted. Mullen concluded that the total effect of car pooling on congestion and air pollution, even if it were done at a successful rate, which he considered to be five or ten percent of allthose people going downtown daily, would still be negligible. This year the Chamber did not plan to promote a car pool system; it would promote use of the bus system instead.

Dr. Yamahiro is the Car Pool Project Director at Martin-Marietta. Dr. Yamahiro said that Martin-Marietta had not been at all interested in car pools. The impetus came from the employees themselves. Martin-Marietta is located 40 miles southwest of Denver and it employs 5000 people. The employees demanded car pools, especially in the light of the gas shortage of the summer of 1973. As a result, Martin-Marietta has begun encouraging carpools. Confusion showed the company that there needed to be a central file which would contain adresses, times of work, wages, etc.

Major obstacles to the Martin-Marietta car pool's success are: 1) arranging employee's work schedules since starting times are staggered from 6:00 to 8:30 A.M. 2) Personal incompatabilities such as smokers and non-smokers; men who want to ride only with men and women who don't want their husbands riding with other women. Some Martin-Marietta employees find their pay docked if they are a minute late and others don't have to be so punctual. 3) General reluctance on the part of employees to give up certain freedoms.

Employees have also asked for an express bus service, but the company had not shown much interest in this because buses cost two to three hundred dollars to run per day. However, in January an express bus system will start anyway, again because of employee pressure. The burden of cost will be born by the employees themselves, with Martin Marietta defraying some of the expenses.

Professor Ralph Williams, a D.U. professor of Environmental Engineering, is the sponsor of a program called the Community Transportation Cooperative. Under his plan community citizens would join a car pooling organization after going through a screening process. The carpooler would sign up as either a driver or a rider or both and would be issued an identification card. Afterwards, the member could go to a node point at a major intersection or shopping center and hold up his membership card as solicitation for a ride. The member driver who also carries his I.D., upon seeing this person, could decide whether or not to pick him up.

An incentive system would be needed with this plan in order to keep a balance between riders and drivers. The plan was presented to the Department of Transportation. DOT rejected the plan for various reasons, among which was a fear of crime. However, on November 9, 1972, Ft. Collins initiated a program almost identical to this.

In the evening session, a person from the audience added that Martin-Marietta had not offered incentives for carpooling, but now they are offering incentives which include a drawing for a free meal; everything but tickets to Bronco games.

Another person from the audience elaborated on the system in Europe which resembled Dr. Williams' plan. In Europe there is a licensing registration where the hitchhiker gets a coupon book. The coupon book has the designated mileage rate which varies per type of coupon. After a driver picks up a hitchhiker and takes him a certain distance, the hitchhiker gives the driver the proper amount of coupons. The driver can then turn his coupons in for prizes. Professor Williams had related that his Community Transportation Cooperative idea did indeed stem from the European hitchhiking plan.

SUMMARY OF THE PANEL: "INSPECTION, MAINTENANCE AND RETROFIT"

Panel members: John Philbrook, Environmental Protection Agency
Don Sorrells, Colorado Air Pollution Control Division
William Hickock, General Motors Vehicle Emission Lab
Moderator: Gary Robertson, Regional Transportation District
Reporter: Tony Worcester; Lynn Willcockson presented her report to the evening session. Both are members of PLAN Metro Denver

Two major problems were discussed: 1) The requirements of air pollution control devices on cars are considerably different than the requirements at the altitude for which most of the cars are manufactured. 2) There is little information about how catalytic converters or retrofit devices work over a long period of time.

High altitude: Denver, Salt Lake City and Albuquerque will be tested for high altitude standards to see if some sort of a basis can be established for cities at a higher elevation, according to John Philbrook of the EPA.

Don Sorrells indicated that a major problem was trying to decide who was going to be responsible for handling such a program. Some want states to do it; some want the federal government to handle it. One of the possible solutions would be the establishment of a state controlled inspection service similar to the state motor vehicle inspection service that is used now for safety inspections. Of course, the fee would have to be increased and people would have to be trained to make the inspections. The inspectors would also be responsible for determining what maintenance was necessary and whether a tune-up was needed in order for the vehicle to meet the various standards that would be set for emission control.

According to Mr. Hickock, retrofit devices are not necessarily effective on pre-1968 vehicles. Retrofit devices are required on certain vehicles in California, but they might not work in Colorado because of the altitude differential. It is hoped that as more devices are tested over a period of time, some of the questions raised might be answered.

Mr. Hickock indicated that there were greater maintenance problems with vehicles when retrofit devices were involved. Current anti-trust laws prevent the major car companies from getting together to train mechanics and to discuss additional requirements which will become necessary when various standards are established.

It was pointed out by the panel that just because a car gets better gas mileage, that doesn't mean it has fewer emissions. Miles per gallon are not an indication of what comes out of the tailpipe and a smaller car engine does not necessarily mean either better emissions or better mileage.

SUMMARY OF THE PANEL: "THE ROLE THE MEDIA PLAYS IN GAINING PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF TRANSPORTATION CONTROLS"

Panel members: Mardee McKinlay, Director of Public Affairs, KBTV, Channel 9
Bob McWilliams, owner, KGMC Radio
Peter Blake, reporter, Rocky Mountain News
Moderator: Pat Havekost, PLAN Metro Denver
Reporter: Keith Whitelaw, PLAN Metro Denver

Mardee McKinlay began the discussion by pointing out that the media covers two types of events, "hard news" and "public affairs" type coverage. "Hard news" covers such things as press conferences and news events whereas public affairs coverage includes such things as public service announcements and citizen editorials, sign-on sign-off spots, talk interview shows and lengthier documentaries. Public service announcements are reciprocal with all four of Denver's T.V. stations; if one station produces a public service announcement, it can pass it on to another station which will air it.

Ms. McKinlay pointed out that availabilities in the news department for anything other than hard news stories were hard to come by. A news report is most effective; however, a well thought out public service campaign over a longer period of time (three weeks) is a very effective way of reaching the general public. The ideal situation would be a combination of the two.

Bob McWilliams of KGMC opened his remarks by emphasizing that the public is skeptical of such issues as the energy crisis and air quality. He suggested that there is a great deal of public opposition to some of the suggested solutions to these problems. This skepticism is the greatest problem facing the media in gaining public acceptance of the traffic controls. Radio, while being more limited than TV, can use public service spots. Radio talk shows are also very effective in getting messages across. McWilliams said that radio stations in general were very competitive and had to apply their own priorities to what they covered. A radio station is flooded with requests for coverage from a number of worthwhile type programs, including various health crusades, such as cancer cure and prevention efforts. Yet many stations such as KGMC are small stations. The only way to win out is such a competitive environment is to create spectacular or extremely creative, different types of announcements.

Peter Blake said that the Rocky Mountain News limits its coverage to separate news-type items. He suggested that the only way to supplement that would be through paid advertising. Blake emphasized that environmental meetings lacked excitement, and hence news-worthiness.

The Panel's concensus was that public opinion on the question of traffic controls is still diverse. This makes it difficult for media to respond or to play an effective role in gaining public acceptance. Where there is any sort of well-formed public opinion, it is pretty negative. The reason for the negative attitude on the part of the public is a general misunderstanding of the problems. Traffic controls would have a personal impact on people and their self-interest. Media, however, could change these negative attitudes.

The panel members' primary message was that anyone interested in persuading people to accept traffic controls should develop a precise message, narrow the issues, and work up a Madison Avenue-type gimmick approach to it. It was re-emphisized that the message should be simplicity itself. The message must be simplistic in order to be acceptable to the people. The public rejects any sort of complex argument. The more successful presentations are people-oriented.

The panel members said that even they were quite confused about some of the issues presented. For example, they did not understand the difference between retrofit and catalytic converter devices and the issues involved. They concluded that if they (who had attended the workshop) were still confused, they were quite certain that the public was still confused, too.

The panel members suggested that any proponent of a public affairs campaign should form an advisory council made up of people trained in advertising and also familiar with the issues in order to come up with an appropriate Madison Avenue approach. The emphasis should be on selling and media representatives were quite familiar with that sort of an approach.

The question was asked whether TV would be interested in producing some sort of a telethon-type program to educate the public about traffic control problems and to solicit some sort of a feedback. The panel's response was somewhat negative. Their reasons were that most of the stations in town are network stations which have a limited program selection; telethon type programs are terribly expensive. However, the panel's concensus was that a telethon was a very good idea.

Another question was directed toward audience analysis: polling the public following public service announcements or documentaries to find out whether the public got the message and was affected by it. Panel members said that TV and radio stations in town did not have any sort of audience analysis, although there was some feedback in the form of letters and calls. The panel objected to the polling because of the expense factor. However, they still thought it was a good idea and suggested that the advisory council should consider it.

Tom McCoy from Channel 6, KRMA T.V. and a member of the audience, said that his station was planning a two to three month's series on environmental problems in the Rocky Mountain region but it was not going to start until September of 1974. The series would include three live television shows which would include an opportunity for the public to phone in feedback.

Bob McWilliams said that media could change attitudes, but that it was his experience that it was dangerous to try to push the public too far too fast. Peter Blake said, as a private comment, that he felt there were already to many constraints being imposed by government at this time. He suggested that the Public Utilities Commission's power to regulate who could provide transportation be limited so that there would be more competition and more alternatives in the area of transportation.

An audience member, Albert Innes of Environmental Action of Colorado, commented that there should be some form of a government or educational radio station which could broadcast public hearings on the environment. We don't have cable TV yet in Denver, but when it does come, it will have a channel available to do just that.

SUMMARY OF THE PANEL: "GOVERNMENT AND ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES..THE ROLE THEY PLAY IN GAINING PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF TRANSPORTATION CONTROLS"

Panel members: James Lehr, Environmental Protection Agency
Lane Kirkpatrick, Colorado Air Pollution Control Commission
John Wilder, Mayor's Office, City and County of Denver
Moderator: Tony Worcester, PLAN Metro Denver
Reporter: Cathy Donohue, PLAN Metro Denver

The reporter and Lane Kirkpatrick had just returned from a speech and press conference given by Secretary of Transportation Brinegar. Ms. Donohue summed up what Sec. Brinegar had said. The shortage of oil and gas would be fifteen to twenty percent. There should be a mandatory allocation system from the refineries. Second, there would be a voluntary reduction of the use of oil and gas by the public. Last, there would be rationing. If the governor of the state and local entities did not implement cuts in transportation uses, the federal government would step in and do it. Emergency legislation for daylight saving time would be requested. Highway speeds would be reduced and alternate sources of energy would be investigated in a crash project. Fifty percent of the liquid petroleum in the United States is used for transportation. We had to drastically cut our driving habits and we had to use buses and car pools. City agencies were to encourage car pooling and exclusive bus lanes. Cities should make use of the new Highway Act which allowed them to use their money for purposes other than more highways. Smaller automobiles would have to be built which required less gas. If we did not voluntarily cut down on our driving, we were going to have gas rationing and a very large tax might be imposed on gas. Gas rationing would require the use of coupons, which could be sold on an open market. Brinegar also suggested that there be shorter work hours and school hours.

Lane Kirkpatrick commented that Sec. Brinegar's transportation policies dovetailed with the State of Colorado's control strategies for auto use.

Mr. Lehr said that the EPA had found how pollutants had harmed people and they knew exactly what they did to people's bodies. The EPA had worked with the State to develop a plan to reduce emissions. In order to reduce emissions, we still needed to reduce the time spent in autos. The tough part of the plan is implementation. The plans were pointless without coordination between state, federal and city governments and highway departments.

John Wilder stated that the City and County of Denver was not against trying to solve pollution problems. However, he said that our information regarding air pollution was incomplete. Denver's Air Quality Control Region has different pollutants than say Los Angeles and we don't know what they all are. We haven't been able to get "read out" reports from the laboratory in Atlanta. Congress had been asked to fund dollars for a complete and comprehensive study by the National Academy of Science for studies to really determine the extent of air pollution with relationship to health and thus far they have not been funded. Much of Denver's so-called brown smog may be excavation dust and road building dust from suburban subdivision construction.

Mr. Wilder expressed concern with the impact restrictions on auto use would have on employment. He asked whether it might be possible that a former welfare person would be unable to go to work because of the high cost of gasoline and other restrictions. Of major concern to Mr. Wilder were welfare costs involved in pollution controls, including restrictions on housing development and the cost of retrofit devices.

Mr. Wilder stressed again and again that the cost of transportation restrictions would have to be borne by suburban, State and Federal governments working with Denver. Denver could and should not bear the cost alone. Denver already

provided such services as parks, museums, water and sewer programs and welfare for the entire metropolitan area. Denver had already spent two times as much as Adams County, three times as much as Arapahoe County and seven times as much as Jefferson County on air pollution control. In short, Denver wants financial assistance from the State for enforcement of air pollution laws.

Mr. Wilder said that the City would be willing to cooperate on establishing exclusive bus lanes if the State helped pay for them. Bus lanes were possible. They just didn't have the money for them in the City budget. Denver wanted RTD to accept partial responsibility for paying for the bus lanes. Denver could not bear the cost by itself. The RTD, the State and Federal governments should help pay.

In the audience was an observer from the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. A question was addressed to him whether funds were available either in UMTA or in the Highway User's Fund specifically for the construction of concrete pads which buses using express lanes needed to stop on. The UMTA representative did not answer the question.

Mr. Wilder was asked if the City would use funds from the Highway Trust Fund or if it would remove several miles of its streetways as a trade off for transit use. Mr. Wilder made reference to the problem of getting the legislation to open the highway users state tax fund.

Mr. Wilder made the comment that it had limited resources to enforce such pollution laws as those aimed at smoking autos. Denver only had a few sanitarians operating in this area and that once a ticket had been issued, there always had been prosecution by the City for violation. The State had been the governmental body granting variances for stationary sources, not the City, though he did not mean to infer that this was wrong.

Mr. Wilder expressed concern about the impact of the proposed control strategies on ongoing and new capital programs such as the Performing Arts Center. Mr. Wilder asked Lane Kirkpatrick if the State would allow the City to build Auraria if it were going to have more than fifty parking spaces. He suggested that State and City officials get together and work the problem out.

Councilman James Nolan, who was in the audience, commented that the reason the City had difficulty cooperating to any great extent with the transit problem was that the city was obligated to provide services for the social needs of the City and there just wasn't enough money for the transit projects. The City needed dollar help with changing traffic lights, for example, if exclusive bus lanes were created.

Mr. Friez from the Denver Regional Council of Governments was also in the audience. He said that DRCOG would now be taking into account air pollution standard requirements in their planning.

Mr. Lehr of the EPA concluded the discussion by offering the services of the EPA in coordinating the various state, local and federal agencies to solve the air pollution problems.

SUMMARY OF PANEL: "THE ROLE BUSINESS PLAYS IN GAINING PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF TRANSPORTATION CONTROLS"

Panel members: Dennis Orr, Denver Chamber of Commerce
Paul Schauer, Gates Rubber Company
Bill McKinney, Denver Visitors and Convention Bureau
Moderator: Gary Robertson, Regional Transportation District
Reporter: Tom Vandegrift, PLAN Metro Denver

Dennis Orr began by suggesting that the Chamber of Commerce was a bit remiss in not pushing harder to get in on the drafting of the Air Pollution Control Commission's Regulations 3 and 9. In other aspects, business had been more agressive. They had gotten tax incentives for health insurance policies for their employees. Perhaps, he suggested, if employers provide transportation in the form of public transit, perhaps they can also write that off as a business expense.

He believed that the business community should be more active in helping to support public transit. For example, instead of strip development (which is very difficult to serve by transit) developers could concentrate their commercial development in one area so that people with various destinations could all use the same facilities.

Paul Schauer told about Gates' car pooling plan. Gates is rather unique because most of their employees come from the same general area of the City...the south and west sections.

What Gates has done is taken a map of the City and placed a grid over it. Each employee who lives in that grid in one of the sections is listed. That panel or that portion of the grid is opened to any employee who drives there to find out who lives in his neighborhood or en route to work so that a voluntary car pool can be arranged. Schauer said that the company had trouble getting the program off the ground because it had just recently settled its strike. In any case, the company was encouraging its employees to car pool.

Bill McKinney pointed out that the City of Denver, as well as the State of Colorado, is heavily dependent upon tourism. He suggested that if there was gas rationing in the Denver area in order to solve the air pollution problem, that we would suffer a great crisis in our economy. The Denver Visitors Bureau was writing various Congressional representatives to get EPA requirements postponed until 1980.

Someone suggested that there could be a two-tier system if there was gas rationing in Colorado. The residents of Denver, the commuter, would be subject to gas rationing, but out of state residents would be given a free reign at the pumps.

A question was raised whether there was a potential trade off between transportation needs and clean air needs...as the problem related to giving tourists the use of gasoline and the commuters restrict use.

A comment was made by someone in the audience that even if the business community went all out to encourage their employees to use public transit, that encouragement would have to wait at least a year because there is no effective public transit now.

A suggestion was also made by someone in the audience that there should be lower insurance rates for car pool cars than for non car pool cars.

Another question asked was whether car pooling would work. Limited test cases indicate that it won't work unless there are incentives. The Chamber of Commerce, it was suggested, could use the Gates' plan of the map and grid and, in fact, make up a car pool kit for distribution to the larger businesses.

Another suggestion which was made was that public transit should coordinate itself to serve the needs of various destinations. For instance, Gates has shifts starting at 6:00, 6:30, 7:00, 7:30, 8:00 and 8:30 and those peak periods should somehow tie in with peak periods downtown,which seem to fall right about 8:00.

A comment was made that economic incentives would determine the use of public transit: if it is more convenient, perhaps economical, to use a bus, then people will do that.

A question was raised about what do you do with the cross town commuter. Some people live in Boulder who work at Montbello. While it's a problem to get people across town in any public transit system, it makes more logical sense to try to get them to live closer to work. How do you do that?

Some concluding remarks were made which received lengthy discussion. The City needs a balanced transportation network. There are places which cannot be reached by public transit. If only three employees live in a part of town, it would be financially impossible to run a company bus there.

There was a suggestion of how staggering working hours helps ease the crunch on traffic jams or overuse in peak periods of public transit. A comprehensive study was done in Atlanta, Georgia...and strangely enough, it was found that staggering working hours would both cause more traffic jams and increase air pollution. The reason was that during peak periods you can set traffic control devices to ease the flow of traffic. For example, lights can be set to allow better flow on streets going a certain direction. However, if lights are set for continuous use, traffic will back up in every direction.

A question was asked of Mr. Robertson if RTD could accelerate its program; that is, instead of just getting 115 buses, 300 buses could be ordered. Mr. Robertson answered, "Maybe".

SUMMARY OF THE PANEL: "ROLES PRIVATE CITIZENS AND PRESSURE GROUPS PLAY IN GAINING PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF TRANSPORTATION CONTROLS"

Panel members: Pauline Utter, League of Women Voters
Lynn Battey, Greater Park Hill
Bill Larock, a Littleton commuter
Carolyn Reznik, Captiol Hill United Neighborhoods
Moderator: Sterling Nelson, PLAN Metro Denver
Reporter: Lynn Webster, PLAN Metro Denver

Pauline Utter gave the League of Women Voters' position on transportation. The League is in favor of a balanced transportation system for the metropolitan area. Balanced transportation is the key to a viable metro area. The League urges citizens to push for the use of money set aside for highways for other methods of transportation, as provided for in the Federal Highway Act of 1973.

Bill Larock said that the reason he turned to commuting by bus from Littleton was because it was expensive to buy gas and to pay for the parking and upkeep of his car.

Carolyn Reznik offered the following suggestions and comments relating to public acceptance of transportation controls: 1) People will only cooperate when they are hard pressed. 2) All government and public officials should set examples by cutting back the fleets of cars and getting smaller cars. 3) Government should end free parking at government facilities and centers. 4)Bus companies should publicize more the advantages of riding buses. Public service spot announcements should depict people of all walks of life riding buses...including advantaged people as well as low income, youth or elderly types.

Lynn Battey said that Park Hill was trying to make it difficult for traffic to get through her neighborhood. They are using various methods: 1) Use of stop signs, four-way stops and lights. 2) Trying to stop the planned Quebec Freeway. 3) Using their very good bus service. 4) Encouraging quite a bit of bike riding. Ms. Battey thought that citizens and private groups should study the psychological aspects of the automobile as well as the economic aspects of autos. Pressure should be directed toward providing better bus service and better bike lanes. There also should be much more input into Highway Department decisions. People should be able to plan routes of highways and transit. She also suggested that there should be an umbrella organization so that each neighborhood and private action citizens group would not be rushing around putting out brush fires with band-aids. She suggested that PLAN Metro Denver assume that umbrella role.

Citizens in the audience then expressed a variety of thoughts. Tom Johnson felt that gas rationing should come immediately. Ruth Austin from Jefferson County Citizen Advisory Council (RTD) thought Congress should ask Detroit to first build buses instead of cars so we would have more buses immediately instead of more cars immediately. Pauline Utter remarked that citizens should have joint planning with RTD and the Denver Regional Council of Governments to see how the highway network related to the DRCOG land use plan in the metropolitan area. An unidentified gentleman felt perhaps citizens and private groups could stress the European life; particularly he mentioned Amsterdam and the place where the bicycle was the main vehicle. Gorden Wyler said we should control the growth of the cities.

Jean Thompson of Bicycles Now requested that her statement be included in the record. (It can be found in the full transcript of the meeting).Some excerpts from her statement follow: "The bicycle is a completely non-polluting vehicle, using no fossil fuels; it is cheap to own and operate (about 1/100 the cost of a car);

it takes about 1/12 the parking space of an auto.... In addition, according to meteorlogical data, the climate here permits an average of 340 days a year of comfortable bicycling; that is, when the temperature is 30 degrees or above with no measurable precipitation. ...All of our serious temperature inversions so far this fall occurred on comfortable bicycling days and we could have seen a significant reduction in motor vehicle use, IF we had a decent, comprehensive system of bikeways. Furthermore, the bicycles are out there. In Denver County alone we have an estimated 180,000 plus bicycles based on the national average of one bike to every 3 persons, plus bike registrations. ...These facts alone should lead a rational being to conclude that bicycles should be an integral part of our transportation scheme. ...We are also faced with a serious air pollution problem, 90% of which comes from transportation sources, mainly the private automobile. In addition, we are facing critical fuel shortages and the very real threat of gasoline rationing. We know from other studies that 60% of all auto trips are 5 miles or less, and 40% are 4 miles or less. That's easy bicycling distance....At those distances bicycle commuting is as fast or faster than the auto, as proved by our commuter races in town for two consecutive years during the rush hour. The 1973 Federal Highway Act gives $40 million a year for bike lanes, bike traffic control devices, shelters and parking facilities for bicyclists along Federally aided highways....Bikeways ought to be booming, but it ain't necessarily so. There is a possible $100,000 coming from Parks & Recreation which hasn't yet been appropriated by Denver City Council. The operational budget was stripped of funding for bikeway construction, but diligent effort managed to restore $100,000 for that purpose....(Citizens should) see that secure bike parking is available...work with local schools to get safe bike routes.. encourage formation of bike clubs in schools...join the battle for bikeways."

A member of League of Women Voters said that people must have alternatives before asking them to give up their life styles. We cannot shut down an automated society without alternatives. A resident of Windsor Gardens said that the metro bus system will provide the routes if there are riders.

Bill Larock was asked why there were not more commuters. He answered that he believed that people in the suburbs were lazy. When problems start hitting their pocket book, people will start commuting by bus.

Jim Jones of the Capitol Hill area said that neighborhoods were too protective about their locations. Greater use of transit would be encouraged by greater density. He said that neighborhood shopping areas should be planned for so that people would not be encouraged to travel all around the city.

Lynn Webster, the reporter, commented about the mood of those attending the panel discussion. She said it was extremely obvious that the people were very, very frustrated. They were also extremely discouraged. They felt they had lack of direction and they were very angry in dealing with the government.

Sterling Nelson had placed in the record excerpts from a proposal he made to the Regional Transportation District in June of 1973. His proposal included: 1)Capability of a mix of fare payment modes to include conventional cash box, credit authorization and prepaid. 2) Capability of providing fare subsidization with a range of subsidizer options. 3) Integration of local and regional bus with PRT from the user's standpoint. 4) Capability of granting and control of special user options (private PRT vehicles, "grand tour", entertainment tours, etc) and 5) Capability of accommodating a complex fare structure.